



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,962	07/14/2003	Alon Atsmon	20257/312	6417
34205	7590	01/18/2008		
OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY LLP 45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET, SUITE 3300 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER DAO, MINH D	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/18/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/618,962

Applicant(s)

ATSMON ET AL.

Examiner

MINH D. DAO

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-42 and 48-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-42 and 48-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/05/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 24, Applicant, on page 8 of the remark, argues that Fajkowski does not teach "processing signals to determine instructions to be carried out". Examiner disagrees. Fajkowski teaches a portable coupon card which includes, among other features discussed more specifically in the detailed description, a bar code scanner, a memory means, a display screen, and a communications port, **all controlled by a microprocessor and operational keys**. The microprocessor and operational keys allow the user to initiate the scanning of bar codes and arrange into various categories the coupons in the memory of coupon card, while the communications port will allow the transfer of coupon bar codes to a periphery device, another component of the system (see summary of Fajkowski). In this passage, Fajkowski clearly teaches that the instructions, initiated by user using **operational keys to allow the scanning of bar codes, must communicate with the microprocessor which controls all of the functionalities of the a portable coupon card**. This teaching of Fajkowski clearly reads on the "processing signals to determine instructions to be carried out" of claim 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fajkowski (US 5,905,246) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 4,479,995).

Regarding claim 24, Fajkowski teaches a portable device, comprising: a device body that has a switch (see figs. 2-5; col. 13, line 37 to col. 14, line 54. In this case, the Transfer key 45 reads on the switch of the present invention. In addition, coupon card of Fajkowski has a thickness of a conventional credit card.); memory for holding device information; a processor for processing instructions and computing data (see fig. 5, col. 3, line 50 to col. 4, line 16); and reception electronics for receiving wireless signals (see fig. 5, receiver 15).

However, Fajkowski does not mention that the portable coupon card, having a thickness of a conventional credit card, has a thickness less than 0.8 mm. Suzuki, in an analogous art, teaches a formed plastic card, containing a magnetic strip, maintains a relatively thin total thickness (approximately 0.7 to 0.8 mm) that can be used as credit cards equipped with magnetic stripes and high optical transmission density which is

Art Unit: 2618

required for positional recognition of the card (see abstract; figs. 1-3; col. 2, lines 25-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Suzuki to Fajkowski in order for the purpose of obtaining better positional recognition of the card due to high optical transmission density as taught by Suzuki.

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches the reception electronics includes decoder electronics for extracting broadcast information from the wireless signals (see Fajkowski, col. 9, lines 3-39).

Regarding claim 26, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches that the processor stores broadcast information in memory (see Fajkowski, col. 3, line 50 to col. 4, line 16).

Regarding claim 27, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches the wireless signals are received from consumer electronics (see Fajkowski, col. 13, line 37 to col. 14, line 54).

Regarding claim 28, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches a display on the device body for displaying alphanumeric characters (see Fajkowski, fig. 2, item 3).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches the display is a liquid crystal display (LCD) (see Fajkowski, col. 8, lines 1-16).

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches the processor is capable of displaying the broadcast information on the display (see Fajkowski, fig. 4b).

Regarding claims 31,32, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches the portable device of claim 1, further comprising: transmission electronics coupled to the switch that emit a wireless signal when the switch is activated (see Fajkowski, figs. 2-5; col. 13, line 37 to col. 14, line 54).

Regarding claim 33, since Fajkowski teaches digital communication, it is obvious that the transmission electronics must encode the broadcast information in the wireless signal before emitting.

Regarding claim 34, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki teaches the broadcast information is a redeemable coupon (see Fajkowski, fig. 5, col. 3, line 50 to col. 4, line 16).

4. Claims 35-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fajkowski (US 5,905,246) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 4,479,995) and further in view of Kim (US 2006/0229114).

Regarding claim 35, the combination of Fajkowski and Suzuki, as mentioned above, teaches the limitations of claim 24 but does not disclose that the wireless signal is an acoustic signal. Kim, in an analogous art, teaches wirelessly downloading audio files from one device to another so that the other device can play the audio files (see claim 58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to introduce the above teaching of Kim to Fajkowski for the purpose of providing user with convenient way of obtaining audio files from a close distance.

Regarding claim 36, the combination of the combination of Fajkowski, Suzuki and Kim obviously teaches the acoustic signal is an ultrasound acoustic signal (see Kim, claim 58).

Regarding claim 37, the combination of the combination of Fajkowski, Suzuki and Kim teaches the wireless signal is radio frequency (RF) signal (see Kim, claim 58).

Regarding claim 38, the combination of the combination of Fajkowski, Suzuki and Kim teaches the wireless signal is a magnetic signal (see Kim, claim 58).

Regarding claim 39, the combination of the combination of Fajkowski, Suzuki and Kim teaches the reception electronics includes recording electronics for recording the acoustic signals received by the receiver electronics (see Kim, claim 58).

Regarding claim 40, the combination of the combination of Fajkowski, Suzuki and Kim teaches transmission electronics coupled to the switch that plays the recorded acoustic signals when the switch is activated (see Kim, claim 58).

Regarding claim 41, the rejection of claim is herein incorporated. In addition, Kim also teaches downloading, recording and playing of audio files.

Regarding claim 42, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 40, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 40.

5. Claims 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fajkowski (US 5,905,246) in view of Logan et al. (US 7,058,376).

Regarding claim 48, the rejection of claim 24 is herein incorporated. However, Fajkowski does not mention searching for content on a server, comprising steps: receiving an audio sample; accessing a database of a plurality of audio files; and comparing the audio sample with a selected plurality of audio files to find a match. This limitation is taught by Logan (see Logan, col. 18, lines 40-53). In since the user can connect to a server, it is obvious that this server can be an Internet server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to introduce the above teaching of Logan to Fajkowski for the purpose of being able to provide user with access to a server for audio files.

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claims 49,50, Logan also obviously teaches that when the server delivers the audio file that matched the request audio sample, the delivered audio file is well known to attach a URL.

Regarding claim 51, the combination of Fajkowski and Logan teaches method of searching for content on the Internet, comprising steps: sending a request to conduct a search based on a recorded audio sample; and receiving a response based on the request (see Logan, col. 18, lines 40-53). In addition, the request audio sample sent by mobile must obviously be recorded before being sent to the server.

Regarding claim 52, the rejection of claim 51 is herein incorporated.

Regarding claims 53,54, the rejection of claim 49 is herein incorporated.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2618

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH D. DAO whose telephone number is 571-272-7851. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW ANDERSON can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MINH DAO 
AU 2618


MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISER AU 2618